

VZCZCXRO4408
PP RUEHROV
DE RUEHKH #0908/01 1060919
ZNR UUUUU ZZH
P 160919Z APR 06 ZDK CCY PER DRAFTER
FM AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2370
INFO RUCNFUR/DARFUR COLLECTIVE PRIORITY

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 KHARTOUM 000908

SIPDIS

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y ((CORRECTIONS PARA 1, 3, 4))

AIDAC
SIPDIS

STATE FOR AF/SPG, PRM, AND ALSO PASS USAID/W
USAID FOR DCHA SUDAN TEAM, AF/EA, DCHA
NAIROBI FOR USAID/DCHA/OFDA, USAID/REDSO, AND FAS
USMISSION UN ROME
GENEVA FOR NKYLOH
NAIROBI FOR SFO
NSC FOR JMELINE
USUN FOR TMALY
BRUSSELS FOR PLERNER
ABUJA PASS C. HUME

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [EAID](#) [PREF](#) [PGOV](#) [MOPS](#) [PHUM](#) [SOCI](#) [SU](#)

SUBJECT: SUDAN: RESOURCE-HUNGRY WFP TO HALVE RATIONS
COUNTRY-WIDE

KHARTOUM 00000908 001.2 OF 002

Summary

1. On April 11, 2006, the U.N. World Food Program (WFP) hosted a meeting for donors and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to provide details on plans for addressing funding and pipeline shortfalls for the next three to four months. Beginning in April, in order to extend stocks through the hungry season, WFP will cut rations in half throughout Sudan and reduce its caseload by approximately 200,000 in Darfur. Distributions will focus on internally displaced person (IDP) camps and a select group of locations outside of camps. WFP stated that it has neither the capacity nor the resources to increase coverage or respond to new food needs in Sudan. According to WFP, to date the USG has provided 25 percent of WFP's requested 2006 funding for Sudan, while other donors and the U.N. have provided only a combined 3.4 percent. The U.S. contribution represents over 88 percent of what WFP has received so far in 2006.

2. WFP and partners expect the ration cuts to affect the humanitarian situation negatively throughout Sudan. The distribution of food in camps only may induce migration to camps, increasing the WFP caseload and further strygm--
Resource Hungry

3. On April 11, a USAID representative attended a meeting of WFP donors and food distribution partners to discuss WFP's plans to address a major funding shortfall for its Sudan Emergency Operation (EMOP). During the meeting, WFP repeatedly stated that there was not a "break" in the food pipeline due to the slow delivery of resources, but rather a pipeline shortage. To date, WFP has received only USD 214 million, or 29 percent of the USD 746 million requested for its EMOP.

The USG has funded USD 188 million, or 25 percent of the EMOP. A combination of other donations accounts for an additional USD 25.6 million in funding, or 3.4 percent of the EMOP. Seven donors have provided USD 12.4 million, and private entities and the U.N. Common Humanitarian fund have provided USD 13.1 million. WFP is in the process of trying to borrow USD 35 million internally, but this would still leave significant resource shortfalls. In addition, WFP stated that it has asked the Government of National Unity (GNU) for a contribution, but to date has received no commitment.

¶4. The funding shortage has caused WFP to cut rations and reduce staff. WFP has been distributing 30,000 metric tons (MT) of food monthly to 2.2 million beneficiaries in Darfur. For the next three to four months, WFP will distribute 25,000 MT of food monthly to only 2 million beneficiaries. WFP chose to reduce rations in order to prolong the number of months for which it can distribute food, rather than providing full rations in April and not distributing rations at all in May and June.

Food for Thought

¶5. The current outlook for the WFP Sudan program is bleak unless donors contribute towards the EMOP. By providing rations to camps only, WFP and partners may unintentionally generate migration into camps. Looting and crime may increase, especially outside of camps, as less food will be available with the convergence of ration cuts and the traditional "hunger gap" season. In addition, it is possible that beneficiaries may take out anger on NGO partners that

KHARTOUM 00000908 002 OF 002

distribute food for WFP. (Note: USAID has received informal reports of this happening in several locations in Darfur. End note.)

¶6. USAID should urge WFP to explore alternatives and communicate clearly with distribution partners and stakeholders. Although it is important to keep ration sizes the same in all areas to avoid inducing population movements, WFP should allow for some variation in the ration size from month to month in order to respond should the distribution caseload rise. In addition, WFP food distribution partners should be getting the word out to local authorities and beneficiaries that ration cuts are forthcoming in order to avoid anger before food distributions are underway.

STEINFELD